IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

SAS INSTITUTE INC.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00295-JRG
	§	
WORLD PROGRAMMING LIMITED,	§	
LUMINEX SOFTWARE, INC., YUM!	§	
BRANDS, INC., PIZZA HUT, INC.,	§	
SHAW INDUSTRIES GROUP, INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is (1) Defendants' Motion to Compel Responses to Interrogatories No. 8 and 9 (the "Motion to Compel Responses") (Dkt. No. 129); (2) Plaintiff's Motion to Compel WPL to Produce Executable Versions of the Accused WPS Software (the "Motion to Compel Software") (Dkt. No. 156); and (3) Defendants' Motion to Compel Compliance with P.R. 3-1 (the "Motion to Compel Contentions") (Dkt. No. 165). Having considered the same, the Court is of the opinion that each motion should be and hereby is **DENIED**.

Defendants' Motion to Compel Responses seeks more complete responses to Defendants' Interrogatories No. 8 and 9. The Court finds that Plaintiff's responses are sufficient particularly in light of the early stage of litigation in which this motion was filed. However, the Court notes Plaintiff's continuing obligation to supplement its responses to interrogatories as it becomes aware of additional information. The Court's denial is without prejudice to Defendants refiling a similar motion if they believe this obligation has not been met.

Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Software asks the Court to compel Defendant World Programming Limited ("WPL") to produce executable versions of the accused WPS software

rather than merely making it available for inspection at the office of their counsel. The Court finds

that SAS has failed to show that inspection of the WPS software at WPL's counsel's office would

be unduly burdensome. The Court notes WPS's representation that the distance between the offices

of counsel for Plaintiff and the offices of counsel for WPL, where the WPS software was made

available for inspection, is roughly two city blocks. (Dkt. No. 161 at 1.)

Defendants' Motion to Compel Contentions asks the Court to compel more specific

Infringement Contentions from Plaintiff that specify the alleged infringement of certain claim

limitations. The Court finds that Plaintiff had adequately specified the components of the accused

product that it contends meet these limitations.

For these reasons, the motions are **DENIED**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 15th day of January, 2020.

RODNEY GILSTRAP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE